REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objection to the Drawings

In the Action mailed December 19, 2006, the Examiner noted a discrepancy between Fig. 1 and paragraph [0021]. A replacement paragraph [0021] has been supplied.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-29 were presented for examination. In the Action mailed December 19, 2006, claims 20-23, 26, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Roses (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0055871 A1); claims 1-6, 9-19, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roses in view of Garrett et al. (U.S. Patent 5,557,728); and claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roses in view of Garrett and in further view of Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,028,603).

Claims 2-6, 9, 16, 18 and 19 have been cancelled; claims 1, 7, 8, 10-13, 15, 17, 20-23, 26, and 28 have been amended; and new claims 30-34 have been added. As discussed below, the pending claims as amended are not anticipated by the cited references and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Looking first at the cited references, Roses teaches a system allowing a user to first select a product template (Fig. 5, [0042]) and then select a desired image (Fig. 6, [0043]) for incorporation into the template to create a product design is described. To find a desired image, the Roses user uses navigation buttons 609 to sequentially navigate through images available in an "image basket". In Fig. 6 and paragraph

[0043] of Roses indicate that, after the user has selected the image the user wants to use, the user chooses one of the user-selectable options 612. If the user selects "crop and scale to fit" and presses the Place Image button 613, the Roses system will perform a cropping operation. How the cropping is performed is not mentioned, but presumably the Roses system will simply cut off an equal portion of the image from the sides or from the top and bottom, as appropriate, to make the image fit the container.

Garrett teaches a system for retrieving images based on a keyword search and then scaling and positioning the retrieved images such that multiple images are simultaneously displayed (Garrett Fig. 4, col., lines 60-67). Wang teaches another system involving the displaying of scaled images (Wang col. 16, lines 32-36). In both Garrett and Wang, the aspect ratio of the original image is maintained. Neither Garrett nor Wang mentions image cropping.

Looking first at pending claims 1, 10-15, 17 and 32, these claims are related to systems and methods for identifying a previously prepared cropped version of a base image and placing it into an image container in a layout. As explained in [0039] of the application, the term "base image" used by Applicants refers to an orignal or parent image from which various differently cropped versions are created "by taking the base image and performing cropping operation, or a combination of zooming and cropping, to create a set of image versions designed to fit some or all of the standard image container sizes." As depicted in Fig. 8, image group 800 has several associated variations of the same base image, collectively identified as images 803, where image 805 is a cropped version of the base image prepared to fit a container of a first container size, image 806 is a different cropped version of the same base image prepared to fit an image container of a second container size, and so forth.

Roses discloses an image basket for user review purposes, but each image in the basket is a different image. Garrett and Wang similarly relate to presenting to a user a plurality of different images. Nothing in any of the cited references discloses or suggests retaining a plurality of image groups where each image group contains a plurality of differently cropped versions of the same original image, each version being already prepared in a size that corresponds to a layout image container sizes.

Looking now at pending claims 7, 8, 20-31, 33 and 34, these claims are related to systems and methods for retaining images and a plurality of associated instructions for creating cropped versions of the image to correspond to the size of image containers. As discussed at [0050] and depicted in Fig. 10, image group 1000 contains base image 1003 and a plurality of image instructions 1004 for creating cropped versions of base image 1003. Instructions 1006 would create a cropped version of base image 1003 to correspond to a first container size, instructions 1007 would create a cropped version of base image 1003 to correspond to a second container size, and so forth.

Fig. 11 depicts an example of a cropped image version 1101 created from base image 1100 in accordance with image cropping instructions. As discussed at [0051], the image instructions could, for example, have defined the desired cropped version by specifying the location of the upper left corner of the desired cropped version of the image (X_{A1}, Y_{A1}) and the desired image version height H_A and width W_A .

Roses discloses performing a cropping operation, but the operation is performed according to a technique which is not discussed or described. Nothing in any of the cited references discloses or suggests retaining a plurality of images where each image is associated with a plurality of cropping instructions for creating a plurality of differently cropped versions of the same original image corresponding to the sizes of layout image containers.

In view of the above amendments and comments, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and favorable action on claims 1, 7-15, 17, and 20-34 is respectfully requested.

The fee for the presentation of two additional independent claims is submitted herewith. If any additional fee is required by this amendment, the fee may be charged to Deposit Account No. 502765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2007

Robert Dulaney, Reg. No. 28, 07

VistaPrint USA Inc. 95 Hayden Avenue Lexington, MA 02421 Phone: 781 652 6360

Fax: 781 652 6092